Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
JUN 10 1992
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

NO. 91-1735

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM 1992

W. M. SCHEERER, PETITIONER

VS

ROSE STATE COLLEGE, AND THE
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION,
RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

REPLY BRIEF

W. M. SCHEERER
P. O. BOX 1552
Oklahoma City, Ok 73101
(405) 528-2410

NO. 91-1735

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1992

W. M. SCHEERER, PETITIONER

VS

ROSE STATE COLLEGE, AND THE
EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY
COMMISSION,
RESPONDENTS

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

REPLY BRIEF

The petitioner, W. M.Scheerer respectfully tenders this reply brief to the briefs filed by the defendants.

Counsel for Rose State fails to:1) acknowledge that petitioner rec'd notification that position had been filled was from a concerned employee, later confirmed by personnel officer who stated that the courts were available; 2) Previous director re-signed without notice over the Christmas holidays,

without conciliation; 3) the determination letter petitioner referenced in deposition was the notice from the local EEOC informing her that EEOC did not have jurisdiction because complaint was untimely filed, a June notification as documented. The determination letter Rose State referenced was never received by petitioner. The tardy and flawed deposition submitted by Rose State at this level indicated that the D. C. EEOC had responded prior to Jan. 12, 1989 and the local letter from EEOC gave specific instructions as to filing for a review. This letter was never received. The only letter rec'd after Sept. 19th was the letter of Jan. 12, 1990.

EEOC contended that the request for a review was tardy. Postal receipt submitted as Exhibit 4 upon appeal (since no exhibits nor a day in court were allowed petitioner) confirms request for review was received on July 18, 1989. There was no tardy request for a review; request

for a review was through conspiracy and fraud, ignored.

Burris and EEOC were both listed on the original complaint, counsel later added the name Kemp and EEOC; Jan. 4, 1991 petitioner requested the addition of harassment and intimidation by attorney, body language and verbal (6.5 hrs.) Exhibit 28. Racketeering was also to be added because of funding under Title V1 and 1X. Sexual and handicap discrimination were not complaints made by petitioner; petitioner was unaware of these complaints until appeal.

Petitioner has been denied a hearing at all levels, although it is a right; Every complaint was documented including the intended thief of residence by counlors.

The defendants' plea to deny the writ of centiorari is a plea to renounce the Constitution and justice. It is a demand to

confirm that regardless of an African American's qualifications and achievements, a white person who is not qualified as specified by the employing agency, the unqualified white as in this case must receive preference. It is a plea that economic tyranny is acceptable. Respondents' reply exceeded 30 days.

Petitioner respectfully pleads that this Honorable Court grant the petition and remand this action to the court of appeals. Rulings in support of Petition:

Poller v. Columbia Broadcasting System Inc., (1962) 368 US 464,L Ed. 2d 458,82 S Ct 486, 5 FR Serv 2d 886 and Sprague V. Vogt (1945,CA 8 Minn) 150 F2d 795, later app. (CA8Minn) 164 F 2d 312.

Respectfully submitted,

W. M. Scheerer, Pro se
June 24, 1992